



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The *dénouement* comes with the finally clinched conclusion of the inscrutability of God (40:1 ff.):

Shall one cavil and dispute with th' Almighty?

Solve it who argues with God!

Then Job answered Yahwe and said:

I am too small! What can I answer thee?

My hand I lay on my mouth.

Once and twice I have spoken,

I will not do it again!

This is the death-blow to man's sublimity in and for himself. The Matterhorn dwindles, and the stars withdraw their shining, and man and

all his conceptions are as nothing, before the sublimity of God, our very idea of whom in comparison cannot be sublime. It is not in that empyrean field that the modern seeks the sublime; our humanistic tendency rejoices in the grandeur of nature and the depths of man's spirit. But, Allah akbar!—God alone is great! And seen *sub specie aeternitatis*, from the standpoint of eternity, the Hebrew poet-philosopher is right. In his conclusion we have the key to the sublimity of Hebrew thought and diction.

DID JESUS FAVOR MILITARISM?

A SYMPOSIUM ON MATT. 10:34

Christians always seek to justify their interests by appeal to the Bible. Naturally, therefore, those who believe that war is an inevitable element of civilization wish to appeal to the authority of Jesus for support of their view. Jesus is so obviously opposed to any resort to force that it is difficult to align him with even the semi-militarists. Recourse, however, is had to his casting the sword upon the earth, Matt. 10:34, and his cleansing of the temple. The latter seems so impossible a basis for pleading Jesus' example as favoring war that it does not merit serious consideration. The case is different, however, with Matt. 10:34. In order to get the opinion of New Testament scholars, the BIBLICAL WORLD has solicited the following letters as to the meaning of the passage.

In our own opinion, the sword to which Jesus referred is the sword of the martyr rather than of the soldier, a symbol of the struggle which the acceptance of his ideals involves, even to the cleavage of family ties and the destruction of life itself. Christianity not only brings comfort but discontent. It teaches, however, that the Christian is to endure rather than to cause suffering because of his ideals. For Christians, like their Heavenly Father, are to love their enemies.

MELANCTHON W. JACOBUS

Dean, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut

One cannot read Jesus' address to the Twelve, as given in Matt. 9:36—11:1 without observing two things: first, that it is very much elaborated in compari-

son with the presentation of it in Mark (6:7-13), and, secondly, that much of the material peculiar to Matthew is found in Luke, who records it in later

periods of Jesus' ministry—notably the period of the so-called Perean Ministry (Luke 9:51—19:28).

The verse under discussion (vs. 34) reappears with slight variations in Luke 12:51. Matthew reads: "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." Luke reads: "Think ye that I am come to give peace in the earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division."

The variation, however, is significant, in view of Matthew's handling of the special document which Luke has used to record this Perean ministry. Matthew's habit is to take passages from various places in this document and insert them into the long discourses which he has taken from the Logian source, as the topical agreement between the passages and the discourses would suggest.

When we take the Matthew paragraph in which our verse occurs (10:34—39), we see that vs. 34 comes from Luke 12:51; vs. 37 from Luke 14:26; vs. 38 from Luke 14:27; vs. 39 from Luke 17:33—all of them passages peculiar to Luke and constituting part of his Perean document. Of these verses so taken from these later passages in Luke, vss. 37, 38, and 39 have to do generally with the idea of the denial and suppression of the lower material life on the part of the disciples, in view of the moral and spiritual decisions with which they are to be confronted, the reality of which decisions is brought out vividly by showing that they will arise even within the intimate friendships and fellowships of the home.

If Matthew took these verses (37, 38, and 39) out of Luke's Perean document

and inserted them in the record of Jesus' address to the Twelve as he got it from the Logian document, it was evidently because he felt they agreed in thought with vss. 35 and 36 of this Logian document after which he gathered them, for these two verses (35 and 36) bring out just this idea of the moral and spiritual decisions which will confront the disciples within their intimate home relationships.

If this is so, then it would seem clear that in prefacing vss. 35 and 36 which he has taken from his Logian document, with vs. 34, which he had taken from Luke's Perean document, Matthew had no idea of representing Jesus as describing his mission as a propaganda for war. Why he changed Luke's "division" (*διαμερισμόν*) to "sword" (*μάχαιραν*), we may not perhaps be able definitely to say; but obviously it was not to introduce the idea of militarism, for this is in no way the thought of the two Logian verses (35 and 36) around which he has gathered these topically analogous passages from Luke.

It would seem, therefore, that in making our verse commit Jesus to the preaching of armed revolution as the goal of his mission in the world, stress was being placed upon the utterance which its literary source in Luke's Perean document and its literary context in Matthew's address to the Twelve would not justify. Obviously, this does not mean, on the other hand, that Jesus held war to be always unjustified and never called for by the progress of his rule in the world. The instinct of freedom and liberty which his gospel has so strongly championed in the Christian ages makes this historically

untrue, apart from the logical inferences which follow from carrying the moral decisions imposed upon his dis-

ciples in our Matthew passage to their last analysis in the resistance to immoral force.

A. T. ROBERTSON

Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky

Jesus was not afraid to contradict himself. He often used the figure of exaggerated contrast, as all popular teachers do. Thus one is able to drive home one truth at a time. But it is necessary to put all sides of the teaching together. This verse (and its parallel in Luke 12:51) is a case in point. If it stood alone, one might be justified in stretching it to advocate militarism, but even then the context must first be considered. The context shows that in Matthew Jesus is exhorting the Twelve to courage in meeting resistance in their efforts to preach the gospel. They are to preach even at the cost of their own

lives. Indeed, Christ's work inevitably leads to division in homes when men take sides for and against Christ. But Jesus did not mean the word "sword" to be taken too literally, as is plain from his rebuke to Peter (Luke 22:38; Matt. 20:52) and to Pilate (John 18:36). In fact, he argues specifically against the use of the sword in the propagation of his cause. But Jesus does not wish his disciples to be so afraid of a fight that they will surrender at the devil's demand.

He gives a peace of spirit independent of what the world can do to one (John 14:27).

JAMES S. RIGGS

Professor of New Testament, Auburn Theological Seminary
Auburn, New York

To isolate this text and use it as a support for aggressive national warfare is to contradict the whole spirit of Jesus. In Luke's version of this text the word "division," or "dissension," is used instead of "the sword." Dissension has been attendant upon faith in Jesus at all times in the history of the church. It is to be noted, however, that faith has

been the occasion, not the cause, of this "dissension." The real cause has been the wilful antagonism of men to that which faith in Jesus represents and maintains. Hence, often, "a man's own household" has been "his enemies" if he became a Christian. In the third temptation Jesus distinctly and emphatically repudiated Caesar's method of

getting supremacy—the way of the sword—and chose the way of self-sacrificing love. It is true that love at times may be required to defend itself by force or punish by force. Love cannot ignore justice nor condone crime. Neither can it use the sword to further selfish ambitions or to satisfy revenge. Peace at any price is not a doctrine of the Gospels. But, while this is said, it

remains true that the spirit of love is the spirit of Jesus. That of itself and in itself always seeks for peace. Nevertheless, the world being as it is, the earnest desire of love for purity, justice, and the truest well-being of men has again and again provoked hatred and strife. Hatred and strife are not of Him who was the Prince of peace. Wilful sin has made the way of His advance a way of “dissension.”

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON

Pastor, Broadway Tabernacle, New York City

The whole chapter is a charge to men starting out to preach the gospel. It begins with a figure—“I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves.” It ends with another figure—“I came not to send peace but a sword.” Sheep and wolves are metaphors, sword is another metaphor. The chapter is a warning against the expectation that justice can make progress without resistance, that truth can be enthroned without conflict, that love can be made regnant without strife. Men are to be loyal to the principles of Christ even

though their attitude stirs up controversy and separates them from their dearest friends. Christians must not be daunted because their ideas are resisted. In a world like this it is impossible to advocate high ideals without arousing opposition and hatred. But in the midst of the strife Christians are to be “sheep.” If there is any killing, it must be done, not by the Christians, but by those who oppose them. To twist this sentence into a justification for war is one of the most monstrous of all perversions of Scripture.

CHARLES R. BROWN

Dean, Yale School of Religion, New Haven, Connecticut

I do not think that Matt. 10:34 has any bearing whatever on the question of militarism. It is one of those brilliant metaphors, common in Scripture, indicating that the spirit of entire loyalty to

Christ would sometimes prove divisive. If the verse is read in the light of the six verses which follow I believe this becomes plain.